

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DERRICK SATCHELL et al.,

No. C 03-2659 SI

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE DEFENDANT'S MOTION
FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

v.

FEDEX EXPRESS,


Defendant.

On July 27, 2006, defendant filed a letter brief seeking a protective order regarding plaintiffs' document requests. (Docket No. 428). By letter dated July 31, 2006, plaintiffs respond that the parties are still engaged in the meet and confer process, and that plaintiffs are in the midst of voluntarily narrowing their requests.

Although the Court is mindful of defendant's concerns, as expressed in its August 1, 2006 letter, that a prompt resolution of the dispute is necessarily due to the impending discovery cut-off, the Court concludes that the parties' dispute is not ripe for decision. The Court DENIES defendant's request without prejudice to renewal if the parties continue to have a dispute after plaintiffs have further narrowed their requests and the parties have engaged, as expeditiously as possible, in a further meet and confer.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 4, 2006



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28